IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORDER

No. CIV S-04-1841-LKK-CMK

11 JEFFREY MARSHALL,

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

VS.

FAIRFIELD POLICE

DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 13, 2005, the court granted plaintiff's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The court also dismissed plaintiff's complaint with leave to amend. The court's April 13, 2005, order directed plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 30 days. On September 28, 2005, the court sua sponte granted plaintiff an

extension of time to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff filed a document entitled "second

Case 2:04-cv-01841-LKK-CMK Document 29 Filed 10/28/05 Page 2 of 2

amended complaint" on October 14, 2005. Plaintiff also filed what appears to be an identical document, also entitled "second amended complaint," on October 21, 2005. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide that a party may amend his or her pleading "... once as a matter of 3 course at any time before a responsive pleading is served." Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). Because no responsive pleading has been served in this case, the court is unable to determine whether the October 21, 2005, document is merely duplicative of the October 14, 2005, document, or whether 7 plaintiff intends the October 21, 2005, document to constitute an amended pleading filed as of right pursuant to Rule 15(a). 8 9 Before the court can conduct an initial review of plaintiff's amended complaint as required by law, plaintiff will be directed to inform the court whether he intends to proceed on the 11 October 14, 2005, or October 21, 2005, document. Plaintiff is warned that failure to comply with this order may result in the dismissal of this action. See Local Rule 11-110. 12 13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff shall inform the court in writing, within 20 days of the date of service of this order, whether he intends to proceed on the October 14, 2005, or October 21, 2005, document. 15 16 17 DATED: October 27, 2005. 18 19 STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25

complaint," no prior amended complaints have been filed in this action.

26

The court notes that, while plaintiff entitles this document "second amended